



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/498,801	01/31/2000	Gary T. Boyd	55241USA9A	9317

32692 7590 03/04/2004

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY
PO BOX 33427
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

SHAHER, RICKY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2872

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

09/498,801

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	----------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

27

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) MR. IAIN A. MCINTYRE (3) _____
(2) R.D. SHAFER (4) _____

Date of interview 2/25/2004

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed: UCHIYAMA ET AL ('032) AND SCHEHRER ET AL ('508).

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: DURING A TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW WITH MR. MCINTYRE, MR. MCINTYRE ARGUED THAT THE FIRST ACTION FINAL RES. (PAPER NO. 25) WAS PREMATURE AND SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN. THE EXAMINER STATED THAT SUCH A STATEMENT WAS UNFOUNDED AND THAT THE FIRST ACTION FINAL RES. (PAPER NO. 25) IS PROPER DUE TO THE FACT THAT ALL CLAIMS OF THE APPLICATION ARE DRAWN TO THE SAME INVENTION (AS EVIDENCED BY APPLICANT'S REQUEST FOR A RCE) AND THAT ALL CLAIMS HAVE BEEN FINALLY REJECTED ON THE SAME GROUNDS AND ART OF RECORD. THUS, THE FINAL RES. (PAPER NO. 25) IS MAINTAINED AND THE EXAMINER REFERRED MR. MCINTYRE TO MPEP 706.07(b). IN ADDITION, THE EXAMINER STATED WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLIED PRIOR ART MENTIONED ABOVE THAT SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES TO CLAIM 1 WOULD BE NECESSARY IN ORDER TO DISTINGUISH OVER SAID APPLIED PRIOR ART.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

- ☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner's Signature